BISHOP OXNAM AND THE PROTESTANT

The U.S. News and World Report (Aug. 7, 1953) published in full the testimony of ishop Oxnam before the U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities. The com-ittee members were Representatives Velde (chairman), Kearney, Jackson, Clardy, cherer, Walter, Moulder, Doyle, and Frazier. Robert L. Kunzig was counsel.

Since the testimony, if believed by our readers, would mean that your editor has een masquerading under false pretences, that he is, in short, a double-dealing scoundrel, becomes necessary, though distasteful, to re-print some of it and then briefly to ex-mine it. We shall begin with some of the testimony.

After being sworn in, Bishop Oxnam stated that he was appearing of his own wish and ee will to secure redress for damage done him by the release of information in the com-ittee files. Then he proclaimed his spiritual view of life which he said was opposed to e Communist view. Then he demanded that the committee cease "releasing unverified nd unevaluated material" which "carried no disclaimer in my case..." This practice timidates individuals, damages reputation, and "gives rise to a new and vicious ex-ression of Ku-Kluxism, in which an innocent person may be beaten by unknown assail-nts, who are cloaked in anonymity and at times immunity, and whose whips are cleverly onstructed lists of so-called subversive organizations and whose floggings appear all oo often to be sadistic in spirit rather than patriotic in purpose."

Bishop Oxnam then listed seven items on which he wished to be questioned. The rotestant was not on this list.

Then the witness testified as to his many high positions in church and state, his arious military appointments during the war, his intimacy with archbishops and kings e has the Order of the Phoenix from the Greek king), his top position in the World ouncil of Churches, and so forth. If this seems like boasting it should be remembered hat the Bishop is not preaching. He is fighting for his honor before a group of men to hom these awards are the badges of honor. If he were preaching he might exhibit other adges, vilification, persecution, execution. He might take as his text that verse in the irst Gospel: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and say all anner of evil against you for my sake."

Then Bishop Oxnam appeals directly to the committee's hatred of Communism. e shares their desire to "beat down the Communist menace". His criticisms of the ommittee are based on this very desire. He doesn't like the committee's files. He uggests that a sub-committee be appointed by the committee to examine and clean out ts own files. He asks specifically that the committee correct its file on him so that t will tell the truth.

Bishop Oxnam concluded his prepared statement by offering the committee the co-peration of the churches in its work.

Then, passing over some pages of testimony as to other organizations, we come to Mr. Kunzig's questions about The Protestant.

Mr. Kunzig: I would like to turn to the Protestant Digest. In the Protestant Digest your name has appeared in the June-July 1941 issue representing you as a member of the Editorial Advisers. If I am correct, your answer to that was that you were invited to serve on the Editorial Board of the Protestant Digest in May of 1940, but two years later, in February of 1942, you submitted your resignation. Is that correct?

Bishop Oxnam: Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. Kunzig: I believe I am reading directly from your own answer published.

Bishop Oxnam: Yes, sir.

Mr. Kunzig: Did you know at the time that you were active in it or that you were an editorial adviser, I should say, that this was an organization, the Protestant Digest, a pamphlet which was in many ways subversive, that Louis Budenz, a former Communist, at a later time testified in public hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on November 22, 1946, Pages 31 and 32 of the transcript:

"I learned toward my latter days in the Communist Party from material I read in the New Times, which is now the name of the Communist International Magazine, that the Communists everywhere planned to wage war on the Catholic Church as

the base for obliterating religion. Also, this policy was developed in an article to which I shall call your attention setting forth the ideas that I learned, namely, of the program to arouse the Protestants against the Catholics in this country as a means of causing confusion in the United States. I have enough confidence in the American Protestant to know that it is not going to succeed, but I point to that because it is in black and white in an official article. I knew about this before I left and pointed to it very temperately in my statement as I left. This matter was presented to me in a conference by the comrade who worked up the material for this article for the political committee. He advised me the aim was to extend the work of the Protestant magazine. This is the magazine whose name is 'Protestant' but which is engaged largely in being anti-Catholic and the responsible Jewish organizations have recently condemned it, as you may know."

That is the statement by Louis Budenz, testifying before this committee, as I stated, on November 22, 1946. The Protestant Digest was cited by this committee in this report in 1944 as a magazine which has faithfully propogated (sic) the good, good Communis Party line under the guise of being a religious journal.

Bishop Oxnam: Would you like me now to answer the question you have raised?

Mr. Kunzig: Yes, if you please.

Bishop Oxnam: Mr. Chairman, I would very much appreciate the privilege of answering this question once and for all. I realize you are pressed for time.

Rep. Clardy: May I ask a question at this point?

Rep. Velde: Yes.

Rep. Clardy: Bishop Oxnam, this had troubled me as much if not more than all the others that are in the files because only recently we have had testimony and I presided in the taking of that testimony that will be released as soon as it can be printed, which demonstrates clearly that that magazine was published as the result of a Communist directive and plot, that it was nefariously started cleverly through using some good people and I wanted you to know that because in your answer and explanation I wish you would cover thoroughly your connection with it. It is most difficult for me to believe that you had any knowledge of that and since that testimony has not been made public I thought I should tell you about it in advance.

Bishop Oxnam: I am very grateful to you, Mr. Clardy. I was an editorial adviser of the Protestant. This matter, however, is of such importance that I requested the chair to answer it properly and Mr. Clardy's statement brought in information that was, of course, new to me and because of the importance of this, Mr. Chairman, there are three matters that I would like to stress in connection with the direct answer to the question.

First, you will please note that my relation to the Protestant Digest and to all the other organizations and I say all—there were two or three that have been named—my relationship was prior to the time that they were declared subversive and I had resigned from these two or three organizations prior to that time. I want that in the record

Rep. Scherer: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point?

Rep. Velde: Yes.

Rep. Scherer: Bishop, weren't they declared subversive because of the activities they engaged in during the time that you were connected with them?

Bishop Oxnam: I am not familiar with when these organizations were declared subversive, nor do I know that they have ever been heard by any committee or by the Attorney General. But to the major matter, Mr. Chairman, first regarding the Protestant Digest and then the second and I reply to that because it was brought into the question by your counsel in his reference to Mr. Louis Budenz. The Protestant Digest was a magazine that I had seen upon the stands from time to time. There is a Catholic Digest, an excellent digest of Catholic magazine articles. I thought there was a proper place for a similar magazine among Protestants.

When I received an invitation from the editor whose name was Kenneth Leslie, a man whom I did not know and I think I have never met but more than once or twice in my life, he invited me to go on the editorial board. He sent me a letter and the names upon the editorial board were upon that letter.

There were the names of Rev. Dr. George A. Buttrick, president of the Federal Council of Churches, one of the distinguished ministers of this nation; Dr. William Ernest

Hocking, who was a professor at Harvard University; Dr. Rufus M Jones of the American Friends Service, one of the outstanding Quakers of this nation; Rev. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of the Union Theological Seminary, who is I suppose the outstanding theologian in the United States today. I need not read the entire list, but there was also Dr. Russell Conwell Barbour, the editor of the National Baptist, one of the leaders of the Baptist Church.

Now that letterhead also carried this statement, "The Protestant Digest wakens those of us who happen to be Protestants to a realization of our responsibilities and interests in the world."

That was signed by Eleanor Roosevelt. I asked Mr. Leslie in a letter that I wrote to him just what editorial advice meant, would it mean board meetings regularly? What would we be called upon to do?

He replied that it would be as much or as little as we would want.

I went into this and I have forgotten when it was, 1940, was it—yes, in March of 1940.

On February 11, 1942 I wrote this letter to Mr. Kenneth Leslie:

"I find that the Protestant is engaged in numerous activities related to national policy, legislation and the like, and that statements go forth from the magazine to the public, quite apart from the magazine itself. Many gain the impression that such statements have the approval of your Editorial Advisers. Several years ago, I decided not to serve in bodies unless I could give sufficient time to the formulation of policy to justify my name as a Board Member or Adviser. So far, there have been no meetings of the group associated with the Protestant, and the material that appears is never considered by this group. I think I must ask you to accept my resignation and to drop my name from the list of Editorial Advisers."

I resigned. But, why did I do that?

Rep. Velde: What was the date?

Bishop Oxnam: February 11, 1942.

Rep. Velde: How long were you an Editorial Adviser?

Bishop Oxnam: I have stated that I was an Editorial Adviser from I believe March 1940 to February 1942. Please remember this was a monthly magazine, that for a time was published only once in two months. Now, why did I resign? Because Mr. Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union one day came to me and said, "Bishop, I wonder if you know who is really back of the Protestant Digest."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "I would look into it very carefully. I think that magazine has Communist support."

Mr. Roger Baldwin is a man who knew that whole field intimately. I resigned because of what he told me, after having looked into the matter.

Interestingly enough, one of the most influential church men, Edwin Holt Hughes, who was formerly here in Washington, was an adviser. I called him and told him immediately upon receiving this information from Mr. Baldwin that he ought to get his name off that list. That is my relationship to the magazine.

We must interrupt the testimony for a moment to show from Bishop Oxnam's own correspondence how your editor early became acquainted with him through a warm gesture of friendship on his part. At Christmas time, 1940, a letter came from Bishop Oxnam commending a talk, "Liberalism and Direction", made by your editor at King's Chapel, Boston and published in the Christian Register. His letter was so warm-hearted and keen-sighted that we were happy we had asked him to be an adviser. It had been explained to him that "advising" could mean as little or as much as he wished. There is at least one letter of such counsel in our files. It was our rule to keep the editorial columns always open to any adviser who might wish to dissent from the "line" taken by the editor or by any other writers in the magazine.

In May, 1941, we suggested to Bishop Oxnam that he write an editorial which he graciously did. It was the kind of editorial which is particularly annoying to the partisans of church totalitarianism and always leads to false charges of anti-Catholicism. Now a charge of anti-Catholicism is today almost equivalent to a charge of Communism, as Bishop Oxnam is so painfully finding out. Therefore we find him, in the ensuing testi-

mony, striving to shake off the anti-Catholic charge and helping himself in the effort by allowing that charge to stand as fairly made against The Protestant. Is this cowardice on Bishop Oxnam's part? We believe not. It is certainly callousness. And it could be laziness! Yes, even bishops may be so busy about many things that they become unwilling and unable to follow one thing to its conclusion. All the Bishop needed to do was to obtain the files of the magazine and examine them. A chore? Yes, precisely. Too much of a chore. Easier to let charge stand as proved, even though it might be false.

The Protestant has always leaned over backward to oppose anti-Catholicism. Catholic writers were well-known in our pages, Maritain, Wust, Gilson, Sturzo, the Saint Francis Xavier fathers, and many others, not to speak of the saints of Catholic radicalism and the modern radical priests like Abbe Boulier and Father Clarence Duffy. Father Duffy worked intimately with us. The charge could easily have been refuted on our behalf by Bishop Oxnam if he had just thought it worth his while even cursorily to have looked into the matter. He preferred to let the charge stand.

Bishop Oxnam testified that he was very grateful for Rep. Clardy's information that The Protestant was nefariously started as a Communist directive and plot! Since the Bishop was there to correct falsehoods about himself how was it that he swallowed gratefully falsehoods about others?

In commenting on this and on Roger Baldwin's "advice" to Bishop Oxnam, which you may note was concealed from your editor in both of the Bishop's letters of resignation (there was not only the one mentioned in his testimony, dated Feb. 11, 1942, in which he asked the editor to accept his resignation but another, dated Nov. 30, 1942, in which he definitely resigned), we must go back to the beginning. Here is the story, briefly:

In 1938 your editor started this journal. To ask what made him do this is to ask: what made him? The answer would be an autobiography. But, apart from the remote causes there were two immediate causes.

There was Prof. Frederick Schumann of Williams College, whose books awoke him to some of the realities of modern history. And there was Roger Baldwin whom he heard give a fighting anti-fascist lecture in Southampton, Mass.

The magazine was started by the editor without sponsorship of any kind, organizational or otherwise. He financed it with his own personal funds. The editor has never belonged to any political party, either overtly or covertly. His views on socialism, Russia, the rise and fall of fascism, world peace, or what-have-you, have their source wholly and entirely in his allegiance to the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth.

Later, when we were in New York, Mr. Baldwin came to lunch, at the conclusion of which he said, "One thing I can report about you. You are independent. The line you follow is your own." He never returned, but we retained kind thoughts of him. Somewhere along the way a falsehood appeared to him as truth. Why? How? The answer to these questions is, according to a strange new custom, hidden from the victim.

In order to understand how and why good Christian people, as they go about doing good these latter days, appear to think nothing of tearing reputations to pieces, defaming characters, bearing false witness, we must consider the following: The fascist enemy of democracy has been virtually unchecked since the end of World War II. He can do as he likes under the forms of democracy because the fear of communism has become so overwhelming and widespread, such a fixation in the public mind, that the public has come to tolerate, indeed welcome, any means to combat it, however base. Just as a man, his face brushed by the wings of a bat in a dark cave, may become frightened to the point of hysteria and lash out in all directions, endangering his own life and that of others, so it has been with the public in the bat-infested cave of fascist-induced fear.

That is the only explanation I can give for the action of a good man like Roger Baldwin, who "heard" something. What did he "hear"? Did he "tell" Bishop Oxnam what he "heard"? Was it the paragraph quoted in this transcript from Budenz? Perhaps. At that time Budenz had not been so thoroughly discredited. In this paragraph he says the Communist Party planned to extend the work of The Protestant.

This or something similar might conceivably excuse Bishop Oxnam's panic in 1942, but nothing can excuse his lack of candor in writing to your editor at that very time when these defamations were fresh in his ears and later on various occasions when he wrote of

ıer matters but remained silent as to the real reason for his resignation, in spite of r earnest plea that he be frank.

But, all this apart, why in the name of simple common sense did not Bishop Oxnam ke note, regarding Budenz's testimony, that The Protestant work from the moment it ıs presumably to have been "extended" was not extended, but on the contrary "dwindled", use his own felicitous phrase, until now it is "begging for money". Budenz was not ıstaken. Budenz was lying. Apparently it has become part of his creed to lie. Baldwin d Bishop Oxnam did not lie, but they allowed the lie to defame a man's character.

Here is the testimony referred to above in which Bishop Oxnam, in no place speci- ıg the charge, takes for granted the "anti-Catholicism" of The Protestant as charged:

Bishop Oxnam: Mr. Chairman, the second matter, which is the most important mat- r, was the anti-Catholicism of this magazine.

That is all he says about the magazine in this connection, just blithely accepting its nti-Catholicism" as he accepted its "Communism". The fact of the matter is that The rotestant's position in the matter of the threat of church totalitarianism is the same as shop Oxnam's except that we fight fascism in Protestant circles just as much as we ght it in Catholic circles. We feel that Bishop Oxnam has gone astray exactly here in at he has aided and abetted fascist tendencies in Protestantism. He is in fact doing that ry thing before this committee in passionately pleading for his "integrity" as a foe of e same forces the committee is fighting. For the committee is not fighting Communism t democracy.

We have not the space for more than a few more interchanges and volunteer testimony:

Bishop Oxnam: In February 11, 1942, I resigned. You are showing me an issue of ıgust-September 1942. I did not even know there was an issue between February and is. I have heard that the magazine was published monthly through May of 1940 and bi- onthly, monthly again and now quarterly. It has dwindled to a pamphlet size by now and begging for money. I don't know anything about it following February 11, 1942.

Rep. Jackson: What was the date of the last exhibit?

Mr. Kunzig: August-September 1942.

Rep. Doyle: If it was Communist dominated you would expect them to take advantage the Bishop's name in the six months, wouldn't you?

But on Sept. 1, 1942, Bishop Oxnam sent us an article written by a former student of s at De Pauw University for possible use in The Protestant.

In the meantime, on Feb. 19, 1942, we had written to Bishop Oxnam pleading with him reconsider his resignation. In this letter we recapitulated the statements and releases ent out from the magazine. These heralded the fact that many hundreds of Protestant inisters were on the march against fascism. For instance, in the matter of our oppo- tion to the Dies Committee (forerunner of this very committee before which the Bishop as testifying) we explained: "I sent a wire to some people on the Board asking them to ppose Dies. I did not oppose Dies in their names. I sent them wires asking them to op- ose Dies. Some of them did. Others may not have."

We received no answer from Bishop Oxnam to our urgent plea that he not "withdraw the thick of the fight". But the very friendly letter of Sept. 1, 1942, gave me hope that e was reconsidering. And this turned out to be correct. For on Nov. 30, 1942, he wrote gain as follows: "After carefully considering the whole question of remaining on the list Editorial Advisers of The Protestant, I have decided to resign."

This will, we hope, make it clear why Bishop Oxnam's name appeared on our mast- ead until Nov. 1942, after which it was removed.

We wrote again to the Bishop, Dec. 2, 1942, reiterating: "The advice which you may ve is only limited by the means of communication." We said further, "I am brooding on ıe strange fact that those who resign from our board always happen to resign after we ave been through rough waters or while we are in the midst of rough waters and they al- ays say that they resign because they cannot advise sufficiently. As a member of the oard you have at all times access to the pages of the magazine to attack as severely as ou like any of its projects or its policies. Self-criticism is a basic policy."

(Concluded on p. 9)

ASPECTS OF THE ROSENBERG CASE

The Press, The Supreme Court, The President

By James L. Brewer

Following the U.S. government's execution of the Rosenbergs on the charge of being spies, the chief defense attorney said in a statement on the case:

"In the days following the trial in March, 1951, every avenue of information and publicity suddenly closed. A conspiracy of silence settled on the press. Our great newspapers, which, during the trial, had seized eagerly upon every propaganda release of the prosecution closed their pages to all news about the victims. From the government point of view, and from the point of view of its ally, the press, the Rosenbergs were as good as dead."

Emanuel Bloch's stricture on the lack of integrity of the American Power Press simply confirms a well-established notoriety.

With respect to the Rosenberg tragedy this press depravity is a matter of deepest account as to the democratic institutional survival of the American society.

The offense can be well illustrated by an editorial in the leading journal of the Gannett chain of a score of city newspapers. Listen to the savage cry for the lethal decree, written, it should be remembered, before the execution:

> "Convicted traitors are Mr. and Mrs. Julius Rosenberg. Every legal trick has been invoked to get them new trials, leniency or at least prison terms.
>
> "And still the defending lawyers refuse to take No for an answer. With a last ditch ingenuity worthy of a better cause they seek new legal loopholes after the Supreme Court yesterday presumably closed the case by refusing for the fourth time to review the evidence.
>
> "Thus the staged exhibition to wring every bit of emotional publicity out of this case will go on...
>
> "Who among those who protest the execution of this precious pair can estimate the number of lives it has helped snuff? According to the evidence not disproved after several efforts, the Rosenbergs put the world's most potent weapon in the hands of our most likely enemy...
>
> "Our courts have been patient! They have been convinced of the Rosenberg guilt. Out of the whole unpleasant affair arise some questions. How far can a lawyer go in proposing new trials? Is there no penalty for the lawyer who produces evidence which the judge quickly pronounces 'flimsy'? What are the wrongs and rights of political picketing? Who pays the bill for all this frantic wriggling to free the pair?
>
> "Justice Frankfurter of the Supreme Court has taken the unusual step of writing a post mortem statement on the Rosenberg case. It is a protest against the court's quick action in upsetting Justice Douglas' stay of execution.
>
> "'To be writing an opinion in a case affecting two lives after the curtain has been rung down upon them has the appearance of pathetic futility,' Frankfurter admitted. 'But history also has its claims.'
>
> "It appears to us, as laymen, that the justice is more intent upon protecting the devious rigamarole of legal practice than upon guaranteeing justice. Justice clearly was done in this case despite all the technicalities and legal legerdemain conjured up by a smart defense."

* * * * * * * * *

Protest by this writer as a member of the Bar against gross unfairness in the opinion given and misrepresentation of the vital elements of the case, presenting a cogent, restrained analysis from the legal standpoint, met denial of publication.

Let us consider this case which bids fair ever to haunt the conscience of America.

The disposal of the case by panic in the administration and in the majority of the Supreme Court was unprecendented in American history.

This majority has been stamped by high legal scholarship of the nation's topmost aw schools as the most incompetent of a generation, and its last Truman appointee as characterized by the late Harold Ickes as the most unfit designation in the high ourt's history.

The stark tragedy of the summary disposition of the case was revealed in Presi- ent Eisenhower's adamant rejection of the deeply-founded considerations for delay: he overwhelming clemency appeals, the possibility of a new trial on newly-discovered vidence, and the need of insurance against irrevocability of the horrible death fate in ase of mistake and in view of the steadfast maintenance of innocence by the victims o the last.

Gravent exception was to be taken to the President's sweeping statement that "the egal proceedings of democracy have been marshalled to their maximum strength to rotect the lives of convicted spies—when in their most solemn judgment the tribunals f the United States have adjudged them guilty and the sentence just."

In answer to this Justice Black of the Supreme Court bluntly noted: "This court as never reviewed this record and has never affirmed the fairness of the trial below."

After the final death ruling the President ignored a telegram from Rosenberg ounsel, including Law Professor Malcom Sharp of the University of Chicago, for a inal hearing on clemency. This telegram quoted Douglas' and Black's dissents (later oined in by Frankfurter), noting that the Supreme Court had never reviewed, or af- irmed, the propriety of the Rosenberg verdict. The telegram maintained that the 'record reeks with perjury and fraud".

The substantial division of 6 to 3 in the court on the Douglas stay, supporting loubt in the proceedings, in conjunction with the close prior division of the court, 5 to 4, on application for stay, was accorded by the President no influence. The 3 lissents and even the majority statement of the court, make it clear the condemned ad not received "the benefit of every safeguard which American justice can provide," s the President claimed. Justice Jackson said the vacating of the Douglas stay was 'not to be construed as endorsing the wisdom or appropriateness to this case of a leath sentence."

Justice Frankfurter did not vote at first because there was not time for requisite study, he said. He scored the claim that the case had taken long enough. Such an at- itude, he said, impairs deliberate judicial judgment. He joined Douglas in according substance to the new appeal as against an illegal sentence, in that the case came under he Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and not the Espionage Act of 1917. Under the later Act leath might not be imposed except on jury recommendation and demonstration of intent o injure the United States. He supported Justice Black's contention of "unseemly aste" in the procedure on the Douglas stay. The case called for "ample time and an unhurried mind".

The executed couple received the form but not the reality of due process of law. Proper deliberation was mathematically precluded. Justice Douglas gave 12 hours study before issuing the stay. The full court gave 3 hours to hearing of arguments and took 3 hours for deliberation, just 6 hours total consideration before rushing pell- mell to its decision for summary death.

Probing the facts of the enactment of the Atomic Energy law, Justice Frankfurter pronounced unlawful caprice in the assumption by the prosecutor of the authority to make the choice between the 1917 Act and the 1946 Act. There being such drastic dif- ference in the authority to take life thereunder, this question should have been resolved only by deliverate judicial decision, which necessity the court, in its haste to be fin- ished, passed over.

Justice Frankfurter further noted that the death-dealing Judge Kaufman himself had termed the case one of "conspiracy", which would bring it under the Atomic En- ergy Act barring death sentence without jury recommendation. Prophetically, indeed, the Justice concluded, "To be writing an opinion in a case affecting two lives after the curtain has been rung down upon them has the appearance of pathetic futility. But history also has its claims."

Instead of being cavalierly dismissed in a few flippant words of editorial comment, as merely defending "devious rigamarole," "technicalities" and "legal legerdemain con-

jured up by a smart defense" Justice Frankfurter's extraordinary post-mortem opinion commands fullest consideration as a profoundly challenging legal analysis.

Justice Black made no bones of expressing doubt that guilt had been fairly established. Six times the case was brought to the Supreme Court but at no time did the court actually review the trial record of facts. Maintaining a stolid attitude of cold, technical discretion, the majority refused to go into the trial record.

"In the death case judicial haste is peculiarly out of place," said Justice Black, "and it seemed this court had not time or opportunity for sufficient study to give informed judgment."

The praiseworthy last-hour voluntary intercession in the case of important new lawyers raised the gravest question as to the legality of the trial.

As additional rebuke for the callous concern given the case it is pertinent to refer to a Circuit Court of Appeals declaration, which, in commenting on the astonishing, prejudicial tactics of the trial court prosecutor, stated that the defendants should have had a new trial on that issue. This point, however, deplorably, was not raised by the defense at the time.

A sorry show of attempted justitication of his court's performance was made by Chief Justice Vinson when he confessed its stolid departure from ordinary procedure in the face of the agonizing emergency.

The insensitivity of the military mind was no more tragically revealed than in the President's rebuff to a clemency plea by Dr. Bernard M. Loomer, Dean of Chicago University Theological Department, and two other clergymen. They were shocked to find that the President's decision was apparently based on the entirely irrelevant, military experience in the execution of erring soldiers under the military code.

As to the "betrayal" of atomic bomb secrets by the Rosenbergs, Harold Urey, eminent atomic scientist, one of the prime producers of the weapon, expressed to the President his strong belief that: "the case against the Rosenbergs outrages logic and justice."

No one has more profoundly expressed the feeling abroad in the matter than Jean-Paul Sartre, the brilliant French author, playwright and philosopher, addressing America in the Paris Liberator. It has been published in full in the N.Y. National Guardian. Sartre utters a "J'accuse" as confounding as the famous outcry of Emil Zola in the Dreyfus case:

"Whether you gave life or death to the Rosenbergs was the measure of whether you were preparing for peace or world war. But yesterday it was the whole of Europe that moved as one—its masses, its priests, its cabinet ministers, its heads of state—to ask you to make the simplest gesture of humanity. We were not asking for your dollars, nor for your armaments, nor for your soldiers, only two lives, for two innocent lives.

"Have you ever understood the scope of this extraordinary truce. Class conflicts, the oldest bitternesses—all were set aside; the Rosenbergs had produced European unity. One word from you and you too would have reaped the benefits of this unification. The whole of Europe would have honored you. You answered 'To hell with Europe.'

"Very well but don't come to us any more with talk of an alliance. Allies consult one another, talk matters over, make mutual concessions. If you answer 'No', when all we ask you is not to dishonor yourself to no purpose, how can we believe that you will allow us to speak out when our larger interests are at stake?

"Your country is sick with fear. You are afraid of everything: of the Soviets, of the Chinese, of the Europeans. You are afraid of one another, you are afraid of the shadow of your own bomb..."

* * * * * * * * *

No more typical example of the perversion of the free press in America is to be found than the total community dominion of the Gannett press in the home head of its chain, the first-class city of Rochester, New York.

Here is a totalitarian, propagandist-packed press of strictly one-sided opinion with its news-labeled columns inciting to international hatreds and domestic terrorism. Not only has the news been marked by editorial content, but there has emerged under sponsorship of the news services pretentious, auxilliary opinion-services by self-

styled analysts. One finds in the typical Rochester press a fulsome patronage of such "analysts" under the AP stamp. Pile on to this, under the patronage of the Gannett monopoly, similar loaded-opinion grists from Scripps-Howard, United Press, and Hearst International News hacks and there appears the "great design" of rigged, card-stacking, thought-control. There is the crisis of our democracy!

In anguished outcry against the press treatment of the struggle to save the Rosenbergs were these words of the chief counsel: "Let us never forget that it was Nazism that killed the Rosenbergs, for, if we do, we will cringe, we will be on our knees and be afraid. Insanity, irrationality, barbarism and murder seem to be part of the feeling of those who rule us."

* * * * * * * * *

Bishop Oxnam and The Protestant (Continued from p. 5)

In view of Bishop Oxnam's testimony that he knew nothing of The Protestant after Feb. 11, it gives one a strange feeling to read his letters of Sept. 1942 and Nov. 1942 and the note from Ralph Stoody, saying "Bishop Oxnam thought you might like the text of this statement he issued..." I did like it and wrote him so. Also his letter of Oct. 9, 1944, commenting at some length on my editorial The Holy Cartel's "Peace Pattern". Also his brief but friendly word on Jan. 15, 1945, and a letter dated June 24, 1946.

Well, these post Feb. 11, 1942 connections with The Protestant were doubtless forgotten by Bishop Oxnam in the heat of Mr. Kunzig's questioning. But there is no Christian answer that we know of to a slap in the face, and that is what Bishop Oxnam's taunt about "begging for money" amounts to.

I shall not deal here with the untruths told the Committee by former members of the Communist Party, untruths to which Bishop Oxnam listened without protest. The untruth by Johnson is easily refutable because it pretends to be based on the contents of the magazine. The Budenz story can be neither verified nor refuted because it deals with what somebody said to somebody confidentially in the dark. It is the way skillful liars lie.

When asked by Rep. Jackson if he had contributed to The Protestant, Bishop Oxnam answered: "I made an address which they published. It had something to do with clerical-fascism and they asked if they could reprint it and I said they could."

But that was not at all the way it happened, as we have indicated, and as his correspondence will amply show. We asked him for an editorial. He wrote it as such. It was printed and he was highly gratified at the praise it received.

In the August ONE we dealt briefly with the subject of Protestantism and the Congressional Inquisition. In that article we tried to point out the distinction, a vastly important distinction, between communism and communist dictatorship. We suggested that in the Christian view communism was undoubtedly to be considered as a good, and also that, once having passed the point of no return on the way to fascism, a democracy cannot recover itself without first going through a stage of communist dictatorship. In such a situation a communist dictatorship becomes a necessary evil, to be endured only until the power of fascism has been broken.

This may seem harsh doctrine. These are harsh times. Our capitalism may resist the voice of fascism. At present it moves hypnotically in the direction of fascism. The committee before which Bishop Oxnam scraped and bowed is an agent of fascism. Every day of its operation it cripples a new segment of democracy and makes it more likely that at some future date the country will face the terrible necessity of undergoing the tutelage of a communist dictatorship. Those of us who oppose such committees and maintain the prerogatives of democracy help to avoid that necessity. Those who aid and abet such committees (asking only that their own skins be saved) are courting that necessity.

* * * * * * * * * *

ONE

(Formerly The Protestant)

SEPTEMBER 1953

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. E. O. Joynes
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. Mercer Wilson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Rev. Dryden L. Phelps
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 69 Inglis Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

ONE

He hath made of one blood
All Nations

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

September 1953 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

BISHOP OXNAM and THE PROTESTANT

The Editor

ASPECTS OF THE ROSENBERG CASE

THE PRESS -- THE SUPREME COURT THE PRESIDENT

James L. Brewer

Vol. IX, No. 11. 30 Cents.